



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 29, 2023

No. 57

## Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable PETER WELCH, a Senator from the State of Vermont.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, You are our mighty fortress. Lord, You have done wonderful deeds in our Nation's history. When we have cried to You in seasons of distress, You have answered us. Though our faith is sometimes small, inspire us to speak to our mountains until they move. We thank You for Your promise in Philippians 4:13, that we can do all things because of Your strength. Today, strengthen our lawmakers, granting them courage and wisdom for the living of these days. And Lord, we thank You for the heroism of the Nashville police.

We pray in Your awesome Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mrs. MURRAY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, March 29, 2023.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable PETER WELCH, a Senator from the State of Vermont, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATTY MURRAY,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. WELCH thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

#### REPEALING THE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 316, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 316) to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq.

Pending:

Schumer amendment No. 15, to add an effective date.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

S. 316

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, 4,487—4,487. That is the number of American servicemembers who perished in Iraq by the time the last combat troops departed in 2011, over a decade ago. Joining them are over 32,000 American servicemembers and civilians wounded in action and tens of thousands more who

struggled—many to this very day—with everything from toxic burn pit exposure to PTSD.

It is with these brave servicemembers and civilians in mind and their families and all who have been impacted by the war in Iraq that the Senate, today, votes to repeal the Iraq authorizations for use of military force from 2002 and 1991. The United States and Iraq—the entire world—have changed dramatically since 2002, and it is time the laws on the books caught up with those changes.

These AUMFs have outlived their use. These repeals will not harm our servicemembers abroad nor will they hinder our ability to keep Americans safe. Every year we keep these AUMFs on the books is another chance for a future administration to abuse them. War powers belong in the hands of Congress so we have an obligation to prevent future Presidents from exploiting these AUMFs to bumble us into a new Middle East conflict.

I am glad that repealing these AUMFs has been a bipartisan effort, and I hope this process can be—it should be—a blueprint for how the Senate works over the next few years. We will have amendments without being dilatory. We will have debate without stall tactics. We will continue to look assiduously, diligently for other opportunities to advance bipartisan bills.

There are many Members and staff I wish to thank for making today's vote possible because this effort has been years—years—in the making.

First, thank you to Chairman MENENDEZ, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as well as Senator KAINE. To watch him work on this bill, not only day in and day out, not only month in and month out, but year in and year out because he had a such firm belief that it was the right thing to do, was a joy. Thank you also to Senator YOUNG, who worked very hard to make this happen and who brought so many of his colleagues along.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S1007

I want to thank staff who did the great work here too: Megan Bartley, Andrew Keller, Elisa Catalano Ewers, JC Jain, Nick Barbash, Lauren O'Brien, Brandt Anderson. And, of course, there is my staff. I have been blessed with the greatest staff in the world as you will hear about soon enough, about one of them: Lane Bodian, Meghan Taira, and Mike Kuiken.

The American people are tired of endless wars in the Middle East. We owe it to our servicemembers and our veterans, as well as to their families and all communities impacted by the war, to repeal these AUMFs today. I urge a strong "yes" vote later this morning.

#### FIRE GRANTS AND SAFETY ACT

Mr. President, on fire grants, as I said a minute ago, we are trying to move on bipartisan legislation that really matters to the average American person. One of these is going to be the Fire Grants and Safety Act. Later today, the Senate will vote to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to the Fire Grants and Safety Act.

This bipartisan legislation would make sure that both SAFER and AFG—two Federal grant programs that are paid and that volunteer firefighters rely on—remain available. If we don't extend these grants, they will expire in a few months and leave our firefighters without access to the resources they need to keep our communities safe.

Our firefighters, paid and volunteer, are brave. They risk their lives for us. They run to danger, not away from it. We need to ensure they have the equipment and personnel necessary to do their jobs for their own safety and the safety of those they protect. We need this especially in smaller, more rural, more suburban areas where there often isn't enough revenue to afford more resources.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes so we can move forward quickly on this legislation.

#### DEBT CEILING

Now, Mr. President, on the debt ceiling, we are almost a quarter of the way through 2023, and House Republicans have still failed to answer the most important question of their majority.

What is your plan?

What is the plan of House Republicans to raise the debt ceiling? We hear a new explanation, seemingly every day, from some new corner of the Republican Conference, but none of it adds up to what Republicans need most—a clear, detailed, and serious plan.

Even this week, Speaker McCARTHY has, in desperation, tried another new and obviously failing approach. He laid out a new round of vague conditions, each one more amorphous than the last, and none of them with any specifics. Then he pulled a huge number out of the sky—\$4 trillion—without telling us where, when, or how we would get to it. That is not a plan. Everyone knows that.

Republicans have been utterly flailing. One day, they say they will release

a budget. Then they say they can't release a budget. One corner of the party says certain programs are off the table. Then another group of Republicans suggest the opposite. House Republican leadership is doing everything except the one thing they must do: Show the American people your plan, House Republicans. Show us your plan.

So when Speaker McCARTHY points fingers at Democrats, all he is doing—it is so obvious—is trying to deflect from problems he has in his own conference. That is what is going on every time we hear a new idea, read a new letter, or hear a new set of talking points from the Republicans. They are far too divided to unite around a single proposal. The MAGA wing is pulling in one direction, and those in the middle are pulling another way. There is no consensus in the Republican House caucus.

The solution to the debt ceiling, however, is staring the Republicans in the face. Do what we have done before, Democrats and Republicans, under President Trump and under President Biden. Stop the brinksmanship. Stop threatening default. Work with Democrats on a clean extension of the debt ceiling. No more kicking the can down the road.

Speaker McCARTHY, where is your plan?

Democrats and Republicans worked together, as I said, under President Trump. Even when the Republicans had the majority and the Democrats could have blocked it, we didn't. We knew our responsibilities to the people of America, who would be so devastated by a lapse in the debt ceiling and that their interest rates, their car costs, their home costs, and so much else would go up.

Well, we did this before by working together in a bipartisan way, without brinksmanship, without hostage-taking, and we should do it again this year.

#### WOMEN'S HEALTHCARE

Mr. President, nominations on hold.

For years, for years—decades—both parties have cooperated in the Senate to confirm military promotions, non-political. It is simply the military doing its job and promoting people who deserve it. We have worked and cooperated to confirm those promotions to ensure our military's work continues unimpeded and our national security remains strong.

But, today, one Member—only one Member, the Senator from Alabama Senator TUBERVILLE—is now blocking more than 180 military promotions because he objects to women in the military accessing reproductive care. In doing so, the senior Senator from Alabama is putting the security of America in jeopardy, and he risks permanently politicizing the confirmations of routine military promotions.

As Secretary Austin warned yesterday—this is our Secretary of Defense, who is a former four-star general—"not approving the recommendations for

promotions actually creates a ripple effect throughout the force that makes us far less ready than we need to be."

"... far less ready than we need to be," Senator TUBERVILLE. This is our national security. That is what Austin said.

Now, the senior Senator from Alabama claims that his hold has nothing to do with the Supreme Court's decision on Dobbs. Of course, it does. It has everything to do with it. He is telling women in the military they are not allowed to make their own decisions about their health.

That is wrong. I assure the Senator that our women in the military are more than capable of making those decisions for themselves, and I assure the Senator that the vast majority of Americans do not agree with him that he should make the choices for women in the military, who risk their lives for us, about their health.

It is disappointing. It is disappointing to see that more of my colleagues on the other side have yet to call out the Senator from Alabama's reckless stunt. I thank those who, indeed, have raised their voices, but we need more. Republicans, who claim to be such great supporters of our military, must announce the harm the Senator from Alabama is causing.

All of us on both sides feel deeply passionate about issues from time to time. I respect that Senator TUBERVILLE, whose views dramatically differ from mine, has deep feelings about this.

Well, Senator TUBERVILLE, I have deep feelings on certain issues—so do the other 99 Senators—but we don't hold up military promotions and risk our national security because of those deep feelings.

If every one of us did what the Senator from Alabama is doing, the military would collapse. So we ought to move forward. I implore my Republican colleagues to speak out and prevail on the Senator from Alabama so we can get these promotions confirmed, get our military operating to its full capacity, and continue working to protect the Nation.

#### TRIBUTE TO GERRY PETRELLA

Mr. President, in tribute to one of the greatest staffers, certainly, whom I have ever had and I think that the Hill has had in a very long time, I would quote Tina Turner: "Simply the best."

I will spare him and his parents, who are in the Gallery, my singing it, although we did talk about doing karaoke together at some point.

Well, that is what they will say—what they already say about the person whom I wish to honor here today at the end of my remarks.

It is never, never easy to say goodbye to a member of your team. We in "Schumer Land," as we call our group, have such a close-knit staff. We are friends. We are pals. We have each other's backs. We protect each other. It is a beautiful thing. Even when people leave, they are still part of our family,

and we see them all the time. We saw many of them last night as we said goodbye to Gerry at a local pub—an appropriate place, I might say, to do that.

So it is never easy to say goodbye to a member of your team, but it is even harder when that person has worked with you—or put up with you depending on whom you ask—for 15 years. It is still harder when that person happens to be Gerry Petrella. His real name is Gerard Anthony Petrella, reflecting his Irish and Italian roots. I have nicknames for some of my staffers. They just pop up. He has always been Gerald even though his name is Gerard. I think it is 15 years he has been Gerald. It hasn't stuck with anyone but me, but it is there.

Well, it is with immense gratitude—sorrow as well—that I close today by saying thank you, thank you, and bidding farewell to one of the very best to ever do it here in the Senate—our policy director, Gerry.

I met Gerry when he was a staffer for a local town official.

I said: Boy, this guy is good.

And we are always on the lookout, myself and my two great chiefs, whom I am so grateful for, Mike Lynch and Martin Brennan—two tough Irish guys who have kept this Jewish kid going forward for a long time. Anyway, we always are looking out for good staff, and when we saw this guy, we said: We have got to get him.

Brennan sat down with him and said: Oh, he is good.

I sat down with him. He reminded me, last night, that I had him drive to come talk to me before the Super Bowl of the Giants and Patriots—the first one. They won two, I remind my friends from Massachusetts and New England. I met him, and I said oh boy. So Gerry began running our Long Island office.

He did an amazing job, an amazing job. So good, that after he had done 4 years there—whatever Gerry does, he works his heart out. He never burns himself out because he has got incredible energy. But he works his heart out. It was time for a change. So we asked him to come be our director—a new position—of economic development here in Washington. The number of jobs, the number of projects, the number of things he created was just amazing.

Then, of course, he became our policy director. When I became the leader, he became the policy director of the whole Senate. He did amazing things there, as I have said before.

Rarely, rarely can you say when someone leaves, no matter what else they do in their lives, they have so benefited millions of Americans, many of whom have seen the benefits already—\$35 insulin for Medicare—and many more who will see those benefits for years to come. They may not know it was Gerry Petrella who did it, but we do. We do. He changed the world.

His work was so important. We had the greatest 2 years that this Senate

has seen. We led the country, we led the party, we led everybody in doing this with the BIF, and the IRA, and the CHIPS and Science bill, and the PACT Act, and the gun bill, and so much else—marriage equality. They wouldn't have happened without Gerry Petrella. That is about the greatest compliment you can pay to someone.

So, Gerry, thank you. Thank you for never giving up on me after all these years. Thank you for coming to the office every single day and pushing, pushing, pushing.

He is not only brilliant, he not only comes with good ideas, but he is a jackhammer—rat-a-tat-tat. He keeps pushing and pushing and pushing until he gets it done.

So thank you for doing that, for setting the tone of our team, for defining our vision, for laying out a strategy and executing in good times and bad. Thank you for working to the bone to find a path forward to pass our agendas, especially when it seemed out of reach. Thank you.

And I don't want to neglect the fact that he has deep feelings on so many different issues, and he had the luxury and the ability to get those done. So I also thank Gerry for staying true to himself and his values as he worked in the maelstrom that is Senate legislating on such important bills.

Gerry is a man on fire with love for his country, love for the issues, love for the work.

Thank you, Gerry.

Thank you to Gerry's parents, who, as I mentioned, are here in the Gallery.

Thank you to George, who had both of his parents often in the office for many long hours—cute little George—and our great legislative director, Meghan Taira.

Gerry, thank you for all these great years. You will always be in our family. You will always have a place here in the Senate. My very best on the next wonderful chapter in your life. God bless you.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

#### COVENANT SCHOOL SHOOTING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the events this week in Nashville, TN, are still fresh in our minds. The thought that a shooter went on the campus of a Christian school, a school for children—little children—this person who went on that campus blasted her way into the building and then took the lives of three 9-year-old children and three adults, who were the principal and staff at the school.

It is heartbreaking to think that we are reliving the scene over and over again, where our children who are sent by their loving parents off to school, lunches in hand, never came home—never came home.

We don't know all the details yet of the shooter or the weaponry which she owned at the time or used in the event, but we do know that there were weapons that we are very familiar with.

One, of course, is the AR-15, the military-style assault weapon that has, sadly, become so popular in America.

This morning's Washington Post had an editorial which touched me personally and I wanted to share this morning on the floor. I will quote from it. The editorial board wrote:

These attacks are always heart-wrenching. But they're not surprising anymore—neither the massacres themselves nor the weapons used to carry them out. Ten of the 17 deadliest mass killings in the United States since 2012 involved AR-15s. The names of the towns and cities where these tragedies took place have become familiar: Newtown, San Bernardino, Las Vegas, Parkland, Uvalde and beyond.

The Washington Post spells out the specific cities each year where these mass shootings took place with AR-15s and the number of people who were killed. I am going to read the names of these communities into the RECORD, as they should be:

Las Vegas, NV, 2017. An AR-15 weapon was used. Sixty people were killed.

Orlando—Pulse—FL, 2016. An MCX rifle. Forty-nine people killed.

Newtown, CT, Sandy Hook Elementary School, 2012. The shooter had an AR-15. The shooter killed 27 people, including those beautiful little children.

Sutherland Springs, TX, 2017. Another AR-15. Twenty-five people killed, including a pregnant woman.

Uvalde, TX, 2022. Another AR-15 military assault rifle. Twenty-one people killed.

Parkland, FL, 2018. Another AR-15, killing 17 people.

San Bernardino, CA, 2015. An AR-15 there killed 14 people.

Aurora, CO, 2012. Another AR-15 killed 12.

Pittsburgh, 2018. An AR-15 killed 11.

Boulder, CO, 2021. An AR-15 killed 10.

Buffalo, NY, 2022. An AR-15 killed 10.

They cut the list off at 10 deaths in a mass shooting involving these military-style assault weapons, so they didn't include Highland Park, IL, but I want to make a record of that.

Fourth of July 2022. An AR-15-style weapon. Seven killed and dozens wounded, including an 8-year-old boy who will be paralyzed for life.

These are the realities of the AR-15 as it is being used. It was designed to do just this: kill massive numbers of people, of human beings.

One in twenty U.S. adults owns at least one AR-15. Think of that. One out of every twenty Americans owns at least one AR-15. That is roughly 16 million people storing roughly 20 million guns designed to mow down enemies on the battlefield with brutal efficiency. That is the reality the Washington Post reports.

The rise in production of the AR-15 is stunning. AR-15s accounted for 1.2 percent of all manufactured guns in 1990—1.2 percent—and 23.4 percent of the guns produced in America in 2020. Thirty years later, almost one out of every four guns produced in the United States is an AR-15 military-style assault rifle.

The AR-15 is materially different than traditional handguns. The rifle fires very small bullets at very fast speeds. The projectiles don't move straight and smooth through human targets like those of a traditional handgun—our image of a bullet hole in a movie. Their velocity turns them unstable upon penetration so that they tumble through flesh and vital organs.

Mr. President, I thought long and hard about reading the next two or three sentences of the Washington Post editorial on the floor of the Senate. I am not going to read them because they spell out in a few words but in graphic detail what happens to the body of a child when it is struck by one of these military-style assault weapons. I can't bring myself to think that one of those parents might be listening to this Senate proceeding and have to relive the horror of the moment. But suffice it to say, what happens is devastating and horrible to any human body but certainly to the body of a small child.

Mr. President, think of Sutherland Springs, where the shooter, armed with the AR-556 Ruger, fired off 450 military-grade bullets within minutes, killing 25 people, including a pregnant woman.

Think of Dayton, where the gunman needed only 32 seconds to hit more than two dozen people with 41 bullets. That is because he was equipped with a 100-round drum magazine. Even a 30-round magazine, which is now the industry standard today, would have forced him to reload at least once. A 15-round magazine would have forced him to reload twice. The Washington Post's analysis of the time that would have taken reveals that lives could have been saved, potentially six of the nine who were killed, because of the high-capacity magazine that was attached to the gun.

There should be a ban on these high-capacity magazines. It is hard to imagine that you can listen to these numbers and the devastation of these weapons and imagine someone rationalizing that when our Founding Fathers sat down so long ago to write the Second Amendment, they envisioned what we are facing today in Nashville, TN, and in Highland Park, IL, and in 131 different instances of mass shootings so far this year. And less than 90 days have passed in this calendar year—over 131 mass shootings. And as I go through the list here of those involving AR-15s, the numbers of casualties and deaths are astounding.

This should be shameful to this great Nation, to think that the United States of America accepts this as part of our constitutional right, our constitutional responsibility, to own a mass killing weapon like the AR-15; that virtually one out of four of all guns manufactured in this country today are AR-15 weapons. Are we out of our minds to let this happen, to let children in Nashville, children in Connecticut, children be victimized or anyone be victimized

by these at a Fourth of July parade or wherever it happens to be?

I listened to my colleagues yesterday. One of them brought this up in the Senate Judiciary Committee, challenging Secretary Mayorkas of the Department of Homeland Security as to whether he supported an assault weapon ban. He said he did. I do too.

The Senator then said to him: Well, define an assault weapon for me.

Well, it is an interesting challenge. We did define it when we banned assault weapons for a period of time and saw the number of mass shootings decline dramatically in our country. But, of course, the producers of these weapons changed them just enough to be outside the definition. So there is no question that we are dealing with a moving definition, and we have to be open to the reality of it. But is this beyond us as a nation, to define a weapon in a way that we can legitimately regulate it?

Who should own an AR-15? I obviously would say the military. That is what they were designed for. Police, in extraordinary situations, might need them—I can see that—some specialized law enforcement agencies. But why in the world does an individual American need an AR-15, particularly with a high-capacity magazine? It isn't for hunting; that is for certain. It is hardly for self-defense. It can't be much for sport. What is the rationale behind this?

Then you look at the Supreme Court and the recent Bruen decision. You wonder, What are they thinking? What is going through the mind of Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas as he is arguing that somehow the AR-15 military assault weapon that is killing so many Americans and groups was envisioned by the Founding Fathers when they wrote the Second Amendment? They were dealing with powdered wigs and flintlock rifles. They certainly had no idea what a high-capacity magazine can do to a large group of people, as we have seen so many times over and over.

Well, what are we going to do about it? is the obvious question. Senator, nice speech. What is next? Well, I will tell you what is next. The American people are next. If they are fed up with the situation, as I am—and I know many are—they have to make it a condition when they come to vote for Members of Congress.

Currently, the House of Representatives is under the control of the Republican Party. The likelihood that they will consider any gun safety legislation is minimal. We now have a scant majority in the Senate but not enough to break a filibuster over an issue. So we have limited opportunities.

What it takes is a decision by the American people to put an end to this madness. The people they elect to the House and Senate—there have to be simple questions asked for people to understand where they are going to stand when issues of gun safety come before them.

I will just tell you, Mr. President, that as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I am sorry we don't have the votes now to act. We need to do it—not just for the great people of this Nation but also for their children and grandchildren.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I have come to speak on a different topic, but I want to commend my friend the Senator from Illinois for his comments. I agree with him.

Just yesterday, my colleague and dear friend Senator Kaine and I met with four of the families who were part of one of that litany of shootings, in Virginia Beach, where a mentally deranged individual came in and brutally murdered 12—mostly city employees and a few folks who were there to try to get city services. The anguish, pain, and hurt of these four families 4 years after the fact reflect the kind of anguish and hurt that the families in Nashville are feeling and so many countless others.

I commend the Senator again and agree that it is incumbent upon us to do our job. Thoughts and prayers are not enough.

I thank him for his comments.

S. 316

Mr. President, I come to the floor this morning where, after 2 weeks of consideration and debate—and I have not been part of all that debate. I would like to say I had been because then I could use an excuse of why my voice sounds so crummy this morning. But after 2 weeks of debate and literally the way the Senate used to function, with votes on a whole host of amendments, the Senate shortly is poised to take a truly notable action: voting to repeal not one but two authorizations for use of military force, finally taking these outdated authorizations—dating all the way back to 2002 and the previous one, back to 1991—off the books.

This is an important step for Congress in reclaiming its constitutional duties with regard to authorizing the use of U.S. forces in combat. I want to give credit to the Biden administration for supporting this repeal and to the bipartisan majority in Congress who have brought this measure to the brink of passage here in the Senate.

As we come to the floor, getting ready to take this vote, we would not have gotten here, I can assure you, without the steadfast leadership of Senator Kaine and Senator Young. These two have been partners on this effort since 2019.

For Senator Young, given his service as a marine in the decade right in the middle of these two authorizations, I know that this fight is personal for him, and I appreciate his tireless work on this. And starting off on that fight, it was a little more challenging, perhaps, on his side of the aisle, but he has been relentless. He has, through the

power of his passion and conviction, convinced a number of his colleagues to join this event.

This will go down, I believe, as one of Senator YOUNG's most significant accomplishments, accomplishments that I have worked with him on as well—for example, the CHIPS bill last year, the science bill—where he also provided enormous leadership, and I thank him for that.

But I would be remiss here today if I didn't spend the balance of my 2 or 3 minutes on the efforts of my great, great friend of 43-plus years TIM KAINE, who I think we would all agree that without his efforts, we wouldn't be here today.

For the decade—or a little more than a decade that Senator KAINE has served in this Chamber, he has been the leading voice—and a lot of times the only voice, much to the chagrin sometimes of folks in my party, much to the chagrin sometimes of the Obama administration—in working to push this Senate to live up to its constitutional duty—that duty, which is one of the most solemn ones we have, which is the exercise, the power to declare war and, ultimately, to commit our young men and women—fellow Americans—into combat.

Now, this is also very personal to Tim. We both have the honor of representing the State that has probably the highest concentration of military and veterans of any State in the country. TIM also brings the experience of being a father of a marine. I remember watching Matt grow up—our families have been friends—and when he chose to go into the marines, I don't think we were surprised, but the way he distinguished himself in that duty, serving abroad in deployments to Africa and elsewhere and then serving back here in this country, you could always tell how proud Tim and Anne felt about Matt's service. But you could also feel the extra burden of responsibility he felt to make sure what he owed not only to Matt but what he owed to, literally, every young American who served in our military.

So this has been something that—this push has really been one of the guiding principles that has directed Tim throughout his whole career in the Senate. I think back to initially him raising these issues in the Foreign Relations Committee back in 2013, saying it was time for Congress not to simply take a passive role or be a Monday morning quarterback—or, more likely, a Sunday morning quarterback—on the news shows about our constitutional responsibility in weighing in on conflicts that were taking place around the world that went well beyond the original authorizations of these AUMFs. He constantly would try to bring up this issue—again, many times being the only voice—and I know how much he respected President Obama—many times going against the position of the Obama administration. Now, other folks might have, at some point,

whether it was Democratic leadership at the White House or his fellow Members, said, you know: Can't you get off this? This makes us all feel a little uncomfortable.

And my friend TIM KAINE, it is hard to work with him. We are a great partner. I am the glass “three-quarters empty guy”; he is the glass “overfilling with confidence and hope guy.” But even that constant hope and belief, there had to be times during this decade of fighting on this when he had to have lost a little bit of faith—could this actually get done?

But that relentless optimism, that belief based in his faith, that if you keep on something, that people will ultimately do the right thing. And at the end of the day, that dogged determination, all that has come about in these last 2 weeks, is a testament to that kind of hard work.

I have watched it at times when he kept, year after year, kind of banging his head against the wall—and, again, there are a lot of us, sometimes even I felt this way—well, you know, maybe we should do it next year; maybe this is not the right time; maybe there is some other reason where, you know, this can wait a little while; it is not on the front of mind. But, for TIM KAINE, it was always front of mind. Working now with our friend TODD YOUNG—but his prior partners, great Senators who I had the opportunity to work with, Bob Corker and Jeff Flake—he has been just relentless.

And this profile and courage—profile in doing the right thing—is a great testament to the people of Virginia and, frankly, to the people in our Nation that this Senator keeps his eye on the ball.

Now, when I told Senator KAINE I might want to make these comments, he said: But, Mark, we are not at the finish line; we still have to get it through the House.

Well, I think you are going to have a remarkable vote in a few minutes due to the work of Senator YOUNG and Senator KAINE. And that overwhelming majority that is going to be posted here today, I think, will propel this action in the House. And I am very glad to see that the Speaker of the House has indicated that he will bring this legislation up.

There are more debates to be had and more votes to wrestle down and more amendments when it gets to the House; but, at the end of the day, this bill is going to become the law of the land. Congress is going to take back its Constitutional responsibility over the power to declare war and to put our troops in harm's way.

It wouldn't have happened without the great work of Senator TODD YOUNG. This debate wouldn't even have still been alive, still vibrant, still forcing us to do our job without the relentless, tireless work of a great public servant, a great Virginian, a great American—my friend TIM KAINE.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The Republican whip.

PERSONAL HEALTH INVESTMENT TODAY ACT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, as the winter season drew to a close, South Dakota's high school and college athletes were busy. And from basketball and wrestling to track and field, they have a lot to be proud of. The University of South Dakota Coyotes swept the men's and women's Summit League titles for indoor track and field for the first time in program history. Black Hills State made a Final Four run in the Division II men's basketball tournament. And South Dakota State wrestler Tanner Sloan came in second at the NCAA tournament as the Jackrabbits wrestling team notched its second highest finish as the Division I program.

As I traveled around South Dakota this month, I was able to see many of our student athletes compete. I saw Lower Brule take on White River in the high school boys' basketball semifinals in Aberdeen. I caught the girls' Class B, State B basketball tournament in Huron, where I got to see my hometown Jones County Coyotes cap off their historic season. And I was at the Summit League tournament in Sioux Falls as the South Dakota State women began their run for the tournament title.

Being back in a high school gym—seeing student athletes playing hard and working together for the good of their team—always brings back good memories. And it makes me reflect on how sports have shaped my life. In addition to instilling important values like teamwork, humility, and service, playing sports taught me the importance of staying active and made me a lifelong fitness enthusiast.

The benefits of living an active life are well-documented. Regular physical activity is associated with greater physical well-being, longer lifespans, and improved mental health. Staying active can help prevent a host of chronic conditions, including type 2 diabetes, various types of cancer, heart disease, and depression. And for those who do develop chronic conditions, exercise can help to manage them. For example, according to Mayo Clinic, physical activity can help prevent heart disease from getting worse and lower your risk of dying from the disease—or, to name another example, exercise's benefits for managing anxiety and depression are well-known.

In fact, one study found that exercise may be more effective than medication when it comes to managing anxiety and depression. And the health benefits of exercise can also help individuals save money on healthcare as they age.

One study found—and here I quote a New York Times article:

People who start to exercise before or during middle age typically save anywhere between \$824 to \$1,874 annually on healthcare costs after retirement, and the earlier they start their workouts, the greater those savings can be.

That is from a study conducted by the New York Times.

Unfortunately, despite exercise's significant health and even financial benefits, a lot of American adults and children either don't exercise at all or don't get enough exercise. There are a number of reasons for that, of course, but one disincentive to exercising can be the cost of some exercise equipment and programs.

Some of the tools that can help people be more active—like a gym membership or fitness equipment—can be too costly for some Americans. Even registration for youth sports leagues can be expensive, making it harder for some families to take advantage of these activities' health benefits. That is why I recently introduced the Personal Health Investment Today Act—it will be called the PHIT Act—with Senator MURPHY.

The PHIT Act would allow Americans to use a portion of the money in their pretax health savings account or flexible spending account for fitness-related expenses. It wouldn't cover things like an expensive new putter or fees at a country club. But it would allow individuals to use up to \$1,000—or \$2,000 for married couples—from their HSA or FSA to invest in preventive health tools like exercise equipment or a gym membership—investments that can result in meaningful long-term health benefits as well as healthcare savings.

The PHIT Act would also allow families to use these pretax dollars for youth sports registration fees and some of the gear that kids need to participate in sports. The typical family pays hundreds of dollars a year for registration and equipment for youth sports.

Many families say sports can be a strain on their budgets, something that has only become more pronounced as inflation has gone up. And, unsurprisingly, some families have had to reduce their kids' level of participation in sports because of the cost.

As I said earlier, I learned a lot by playing sports while I was growing up, and I am sure I am not alone. Youth sports are one of the best ways to build lifelong healthy habits. They help kids build strong friendships and learn important skills and values that they carry throughout their lives. And the PHIT Act would help reduce some of the cost barriers that many families face when it comes to getting their kids involved in sports.

With more and more of our life spent with technology, we can't overestimate the value of spending time disconnected from screens and being active. Fortunately, no matter how well my bracket is doing, watching March Madness always makes me eager to "lace 'em up," as they say, and get on the court myself. Although, I will be honest, I spend, these days, more time trying to keep up with my grandkids than I do working on my jump shot.

But whether you are playing in a rec league or with your kids, going to a

gym or making a walk or a run as part of your routine, staying active throughout your life is an important part of staying healthy. And with the warmer weather inching closer every day, it is a great time to get active.

The PHIT Act is a commonsense way to help encourage more Americans to invest in tools that make fitness goals easier to attain. And I will continue to work to pass the PHIT Act and promote healthy living for more Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be permitted to speak prior to the scheduled votes: Myself, for up to 10 minutes; Senator KAINE, for up to 10 minutes; Senator RISCH, for up to 5 minutes; Senator MENENDEZ, for up to 5 minutes; and Senator SCHUMER, for up to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 316

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I am proud to join my colleague, the great Senator from Virginia, Senator TIM KAINE, on the floor of the Senate today. And as we await this final vote—final passage of the repeal of the Authorizations for Use of Military Force in 1991, the Gulf war, and, in 2002, the Iraq war—I reflect on just how much work it took to get here, how much persistence. And I thank Senator KAINE for sticking it out.

A lot has happened over the last couple of decades.

A lot has happened over the last couple of decades. Twenty years ago, American soldiers were fighting that war in Iraq. Today, they are still there. They are advising Iraq's army at the invitation of the current government. Twenty years ago, Iraq was our enemy. Today Iraq is a strategic partner, an ally in advancing stability across the Middle East. A lot has changed in the last 20 years; and, yet, according to our laws, today we are still at war with Iraq.

This isn't just the result of an oversight. It is an intentional abdication of this body, of its constitutional role in America's national security. Allowing it to continue is a strategic mistake. It is a mistake that disrespects the sacrifices of our soldiers and their Iraqi partners as well. It is one that could endanger their work across the Middle East, and it is central to our national security that we set this right.

Here is why.

Iran has designs on a path to the Mediterranean Sea. The world's leading exporter of terror wants to build a route to move manpower and materiel to its proxies all across the region. Once it reaches the sea, it will establish a foothold to threaten Europe. This terrorism thoroughfare would run through Syria, through Lebanon, and, of course, through Iraq. Iran has sent many thousands of soldiers into Syria

to prop up Dictator Bashar Al Assad and co-opted regions of that war-torn nation. Lebanon's institutions are weak. Hezbollah, with Iran's backing, dominates many sectors of the governments and the country.

Iraq cannot follow this path. It cannot become a satellite of Iran, and Iran cannot be permitted unrestricted access across the region.

Our advisers are fortifying and working with the Iraqi Army to prevent this dangerous future.

But we are undertaking this vital mission with a nation we are still technically at war with. The authorizations for both the 1991 Gulf war and 2002 Operation Iraqi Freedom are both still on the books. These authorizations for long-ended wars passed almost entirely by Members of Congress long-retired. These authorizations are outdated. They are a detriment to our national security strategy, and they are an abdication of Congress's constitutional role in declaring and, yes, ending wars.

In the centuries before our revolution, Kings waged wars—wars that their subjects fought. Reflecting on this history, our Founding Fathers placed the power to make war not with the executive, but with this branch, the legislative branch. And it is here in our Congress, in the people's Congress, they determine that debate and deliberation and consensus should precede a decision to go to war or to avert it.

You see, the Framers placed this great responsibility in our hands—our hands. And we let it slip right through them. By allowing these authorizations to live on long past their purpose, we have forfeited the power to make and to oversee wars to the White House. Presidents of both parties—of both parties—have employed specious legal reasoning and used them as a justification for military interventions wholly unrelated to their original missions.

So here is the choice before us: We repeal these authorizations; we restore a part of our system of checks and balances; or we let them live on, extending a permanent blank check for Presidents to bypass Congress in authorizing military action. That is the choice.

By doing the former, we not only take a step towards realigning the function of our government with its Constitution, we also send an important message to Prime Minister Sudani that our interests are shared; our nations are allies; that we will continue to partner with Iraq to train and equip its Army in their fight against ISIS; and that we oppose Iran's violation of Iraq's sovereignty and its ambitions of regional dominance—ambitions that endanger the world far beyond the Middle East.

And let us not forget that in case of urgent national security emergencies, even after repealing these authorizations, Presidents can still, as they can now, invoke their article II war powers.

In closing, I just want to underscore the heroic legislative efforts—the heroic leadership—that my colleague TIM

KAINE has shown throughout this long effort to get this legislation on the floor to persuade those around the country that this should remain a first-order priority; to persuade people in both parties that this merits our time and our attention; that these repeal efforts are important not just to this generation, but to future generations.

Thank you to Senator KAINE and his team.

I want to thank my team—my amazing national security team and legislative team—for their hard work on this effort, as well.

I want to reiterate something I know that Senator KAINE agrees with: that repealing these war authorizations will give a greater voice to those whom we represent. We live with the possibility every day that our men and women in uniform could be called away to fight, to sacrifice their very lives for our freedom. We dread for that moment to come. But if it does, we must be certain that the American people are united behind the decisions we make here and that our intentions are clear to our military commanders.

By reclaiming our war powers, by restoring the open, civil, but passionate debates about matters of war and peace, we will do exactly that. And our Nation and its allies will be stronger and safer because of it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, the United States invaded Iraq following congressional authorization exactly 20 years ago, March 19 and 20, 2003.

In that war, nearly 4,500 Americans lost their lives and more than 31,000 American troops were wounded—some grievously—who will carry that wound for the rest of their lives. Hundreds of thousands of Iraqi civilians were killed.

I rise thinking about all of them as we come close to a vote to declare these wars are over.

It wasn't too long into the war when criticism of the decision to go to war began. There is no criticism of the heroism of the American troops who served ably, who did so well, who protected their colleagues, who protected civilian life the best they could. But there began to be criticism of the rationale for the war.

Two of the rationales for this war were that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. That was very convincing to many colleagues here. It turned out not to be true. And another of the rationales that was occasionally advanced was that Iraq had participated in the 9/11 attack. That proved not to be true.

So much of the analysis of the Iraq war, looking backward over 20 years and lessons learned, has focused upon the rationales advanced that turned out not to be true.

But there was another challenge; and today is an effort, in many ways, to try

to fix that challenge. And the challenge was this: We rushed into it. There were 4,500 who died; 31,000 who were wounded, the hundreds of thousands of Iraqi civilians.

What we have to contemplate is the reality that we rushed into a war—this body rushed into a war. The Iraq war resolution was filed in the House in early October 2002, assigned to a committee, and came out of the House in a week. The resolution was pending in the Senate—no committee action, no committee opportunity for inquiry, amendment, debate. It was pending in the Senate for 3 days—3 days.

The Senate voted to go to war—a war that has had massive consequences—with a total of 3 days of analysis. Taking the time to be the greatest deliberative body in the world does not guarantee that we will get everything right. But short-circuiting a decision, especially a decision of such magnitude as to whether the United States should go to war, maximizes the chance that we, as fallible humans, will get it wrong.

I believe many of the challenges that we faced in the Iraq war began with that rush. I am very dedicated to the proposition—and I have been since I came here—that the United States and the article I branch of Congress, we should never be pushed into a war and we should never be rushed into a war.

The repeal of the 1991 and 2002 AUMF has been on the floor of the Senate for 2 weeks, not 3 days. The repeal has been pending before the body since 2019. It has had two different markups in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee where members got chances to offer amendment and debate and vote twice. The effort over the last 13 days has involved 11 votes on amendments in this body. In the declaration of war, there were only five amendment votes.

We have given dramatically more time in this body to the question of whether we end two wars—one declared in 1991 and one declared in 2002—than was given to the momentous question of whether we should start a war.

I think that is a lesson that we should all absorb and learn from. I want to thank my colleagues who have been so helpful in this regard. Senator YOUNG has been such an able colleague in this path from the very day he came into this body and was assigned to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; his bona fides, having worked with a great Member of the Senate, Senator Lugar; and his marine service made him somebody who grabbed this issue immediately.

I want to thank the Senate Foreign Relation Committee's leadership, Senators MENENDEZ and RISCH, both of whom have cooperated to try to give this the attention and deliberation it deserves. I will say this about Senator RISCH: We have had disagreements along the way, but here is a man who knows how to disagree without being disagreeable—curmudgeonly, yes, but not disagreeable.

I also want to thank Senator SCHUMER for being committed to make this happen.

Also to Senator WARNER for his pep talks when I would get down about how come I am not able to convince anybody. He would give me pep talks, and I appreciated his comments.

I appreciate the outside groups that weighed in in significant ways—American Legion, Concerned Veterans for America, Friends Committee on National Legislation, and so many others.

I very much want to thank my staff, many of whom are here, who have worked with me on this and, probably like Senator WARNER at some points, wondered why I was so obsessed about it. Can't we move on and do something else? I learned early, I am not going to get my way by looks, so I better get it by persistence. And this has been one of those efforts where persistence has helped.

And the passage of 20 years, and even the anniversary—the 20th anniversary, has kind of opened a reflective moment where I think we are moving in the right direction.

Last thing I want to say is this: This is, obviously, very important to me, personally, on this topic, coming from a State that is so military in our focus and proudly so, being the father of a marine—that makes a difference to me. But even if this debate were about another topic, I am so glad that we just spent time deliberating, for gosh sake, instead of rushing to a war in 3 days. We had a very robust process of full committee consideration, of full Senate floor debate, of amendments—some that were easy and some that were really hard; some that were really close and some that weren't so close.

We showed that we can operate in what I have never really experienced in the time I have been here, but what I have had glimpses of in this debate: We can operate according to sort of a regular order—the way we should do things. And regular order is kind of a phrase; who knows what that means?

It means deliberation when we are making important decisions, allowing the committees to take their time to do the work, allowing committee members to shape a bill, getting the bill on the floor, giving it the time it deserves. That is what the Senate has been known for since 1787.

We have declined in our ability or, perhaps, our willingness to do it the old-fashioned way, but when we do it the old-fashioned way and we deliberate, we make better decisions. And I am proud to have been part of a decision-making process that has enabled all 100 Senators to participate in a meaningful way.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I rise to voice my support for S. 316, a bill to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq. Sending America's sons and daughters to fight in foreign lands has serious consequences. Those who volunteer for military service, as well as their families, agree to



carry things with them for their lifetimes—sometimes difficult and painful things—all at the behest of the U.S. government and on behalf of the American people.

I am grateful for and thank those servicemembers who bravely conducted themselves in Iraq with honor, restraint, and in accordance with American values and ideals. With that important preface, let me say clearly: I opposed the Iraq war. I opposed the Iraq war before I was elected to Congress, while I was a Member of the House of Representatives, and I oppose it today.

I believe that by any objective measure, the 2002 U.S. invasion of Iraq was among the greatest foreign policy disasters in my lifetime. Not only did it cause death and immense suffering of thousands of Americans and hundreds of thousands of Iraqis, but it also ignited a series of regional tensions and tertiary conflicts that have carried on for decades.

Both the Gulf War and the 2002 invasion of Iraq required legal authorities. The Iraq authorizations of military force were legally necessary and largely supported at the time. However, very practically, we no longer need an authorization for use of military force against a country we now regard as a partner and to which we provide hundreds of millions of dollars in economic and military aid. This bill recognizes the positive evolution of our relations with the Government of Iraq. We will continue to work with our Iraqi partners to limit our military presence and narrowly define the actions our servicemembers are authorized to take. It is also important to note that this resolution will have no impact whatsoever on current U.S. military operations.

Some opponents of this bill have suggested that repealing the authorizations for use of force will embolden our adversaries or exhibit America's weakness. To the contrary, whether one supported or opposed the invasions of Iraq 31 and 20 years ago, it is important to repeal these antiquated relics of history.

As national security threats arise, they should be properly addressed. The President can request congressional authorization for the use of military force with properly debated justifications, after which, Members of Congress will vote their conscience and America's will. This bill does nothing to restrict presidential powers of this nor future Presidents. America will defend herself—always. However, it is critical that America's use of force be thoughtful and deliberate, informed by accurate intelligence, and used only when necessary to preserve and protect our vital national security interests.

Over the years, I have consistently voted to repeal the Iraq authorizations for use of military force. I commend my colleagues, Senators Kaine and Young, for their tenacity and determination to see these repeals through. I also strongly support a review of the

2001 authorization for use of military force which has been the legal basis for actions far beyond what was ever intended after the attacks of 9/11.

For the task at hand, however, I urge all Senators to support S. 316, a bill to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. Risch. Mr. President, thank you very much and thank you to Senator Kaine.

I will start with this. There are a lot of things he said that I agree with, and, particularly, that part about him not getting very far with his looks and instead using persistence. I think he is absolutely correct in that regard.

Senator Kaine has been a true, committed, good-faith warrior on this issue, as has Senator Young, and some of the things that were said out here are absolutely accurate and deserve to be underscored and things that I agree with.

First of all, I really appreciate Senator Kaine pointing out the fact that the deliberations on this particular repeal of the AUMF to get the rule off of the books regarding war has taken a whole lot longer and a lot more deliberation than the actual passage of it to get into the war.

It is easy to stand here and say that people were wrong who did this 20 years ago. I don't know how many are left. There is only a handful, maybe half a dozen, who were on this floor at the time they voted for it. In their defense, of course, they had information that was very different than the information that we have today, which is unfortunate, because, as you have pointed out, there has been a lot of harm done as a result of this.

So we should start with that, and that is that one of the most important things we do here in Congress is deliberating whether or not to send our sons and daughters into harm's way in war. There is nothing more somber than that, and to those who actually fought in this war, the view that America has toward them of appreciation for their taking up the arms when we asked them to do so cannot be overstated. It is a tremendous sacrifice that they have made, and we owe them a lot.

Having said that, I come back to what Senator Kaine has said for a long time. If that vote were held today, I think it would be unanimous that we not pull the trigger as was done 20 years ago. But that was then and this is now, and the information is very different.

So to the men and women in uniform, their service was honorable. Less than 1 percent of Americans raise their hands to answer the Nation's call when this happens, and we have to commend them for that.

While I support the repeal of the 1991 Gulf war authorization, I don't support the repeal of this 2002 AUMF at this time. This needs to be repealed; there is no question about it. It should be re-

placed by something, and that is one of the real problems here, because the debate to do that has been ongoing for as long as I have been here, and we have been unable to land on the same point to get it done. Again, we mostly agree, but there is handful of disagreements on it. So with that, I cannot vote for it at this time.

Part of the problem—well, there are two problems here: One is the fluidity in Iraq at this time, and the second one Senator Young properly and clearly outlined what the ambitions of Iran are. The fluidity in Iraq and the ambitions of Iran are the two reasons why I am opposed to repealing at this time.

Iraq itself is a less-than-perfect security partner. All of us on Foreign Relations have dealt with that issue over and over again, as we have had ups and downs there. They are a less-than-perfect partner.

I have serious concerns about the influence of the Iranian-aligned militias, which I know my friends do also. These are real problems. Across multiple administrations—both Republican and Democrat administrations—the 2002 AUMF has been used to address threats emanating from Iraq.

Specifically, multiple administrations have relied on its authority to address the threat from Iran-backed militias, and Iran is clearly the problem here. I have been in the room when these decisions were made. I have participated in those decisions, and the 2002 AUMF was a factor in those decisions.

Should the statutory authority fall away, we are only left with the President's constitutional article II powers to protect Americans. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle and some on my side of the aisle are quick to point out that the President's constitutional authorities are used as an excuse to support repeal, what we are doing here. But those constitutional authorities are unfettered and really unrestrained as far as the President is concerned.

So by repealing this, instead of reasserting congressional authority, we are actually ceding solely to the President, the executive branch, which no one in this room wants to do.

Further repeal signals finality and an end to hostilities but, the Iranian-backed militias continue to attack us. Iran has long sought to eject the United States from Iraq, but Iran and its proxies have attacked American troops and diplomats over 80 times just since President Biden took office and with only a few U.S. responses.

It is clear that Iran doubts American resolve. I stand here today to say to Iran: Have no doubts. We do have resolve.

Just last week, we lost yet another American in Syria at the hands of an Iranian-supported militia. It is objectionable that the administration didn't notify Congress of this attack until after we completed debate on relevant amendments and had adjourned for the week.



I know my colleagues who are on the other side of this issue probably have the same bad feelings about that that I do. This was not right, to withhold this information from us.

The Biden administration talks about defending our interests and deterring Iran. The administration launched a strike in retaliation for killing that American last Thursday, but in response the Iran-backed militias simply conducted an even larger attack against us.

The truth is the administration is failing and has failed in its attempts to deter Iran, and today we are in not a very good position in that regard. That is why this repeal sends an additional dangerous message at a poor time and further weakens U.S. engagement in the region.

It is clear the region sees the Biden administration sitting on the sidelines. This repeal will only add fuel to the narrative that the United States is disengaging from the region, which we hear all the time. We should remember that great power competition is global, not just in Asia and the Pacific, though, of course, those issues have raised their ugly head in recent years.

I also remain unconvinced that the administration has conducted any meaningful consultations with Iraq, Israel, or other partners on the repeal of this authority and how those reactions may affect U.S. burdens and commitments in the region. Consultation with our partners is always important.

Finally, turning to detention authority, for years the 2002 AUMF has been cited as authority for detention for known captured terrorists. Last week, I put forward an amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense to certify that repeal of this authority would not harm detention authority or the U.S. litigation positions against detained terrorists. If a court were to find that the 2001 AUMF did not provide legal authority for detention, which has not been settled at this point, supplemental legal authorities like the 2002 AUMF would be absolutely critical.

I sincerely would like to support this repeal—I really would. And I hope to be here when we do get to repeal at some point down the line, but now is not the time for it. The realities on the ground convince me I cannot support repeal at this time. We have got to deal with the world as it is, and, as a result of that, I am compelled to vote no.

Thank you very much, Mr. President, and thank you for all those who have worked on this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, this vote that we are about to take today has deep personal significance for me and for many others. For me, as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I finally have come full circle from my vote in the House of Representatives 21 years ago when I did not support the 2002 AUMF.

I have, for my 31 years in Congress, had a standard. If the cause is right and the Nation needs it, then I will vote to send my son and daughter into war, and I will vote to send anyone else's sons and daughters into war. But if the cause is not right and the Nation truly doesn't need it, not only will I not send my son and daughter into war, I won't vote to send anyone else's sons and daughters into war.

And, at that time, as a Member of the House, I did my due diligence with all the evidence that was available, and I saw no clear and present danger, no imminent threat to the United States, and, above all, no evidence—underline “evidence”—of weapons of mass destruction. So I voted no. I was in the minority at the time, and it was, in many respects, a tough vote, but it was the right vote.

It is significant for some of my fellow Senators who also themselves, many, have fought in the war in Iraq, and I echo what Senator RISCH, the ranking member said. When our sons and daughters answer the call, they don't say: Is this the right or wrong war?

They just say: I am here to serve.

And so we honor their service, both in the Iraq war and in the Gulf war before it. And I think what we do today, actually, is the ultimate way in which we honor it. It is significant for those whose sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, friends and loved ones have fought, and it is significant because, for the first time in five decades, when Congress repealed the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, we are ending a war—the first time in five decades.

So, today, I want to speak about what we are accomplishing together as we turn the page on that war and that chapter of American foreign policy. It has taken 21 long years for this body to reevaluate the adoption of the 2002 AUMF, and, today, we are working together—and this is the ultimate expression of what this body should be; working together, Democrats and Republicans—to support repeal.

And I want to salute the majority leader, Senator SCHUMER, for giving us the time on the floor and a process for which the weightiness of what we are doing could be fully considered, and I salute him for doing so.

That makes this historic vote a bipartisan vote. With this vote, we make clear that the Iraq of 2023 is not the Iraq of 2003. Far from being a menace to the region, today's Iraq is a willing U.S. partner that seeks closer integration with its Arab neighbors.

With this vote, we can show the world that the United States is a strong partner, that we are not an occupying force, that we engage with partner countries when their interests are aligned with ours.

This vote shows that, while we still face challenges and threats to U.S. interests—and I agree with my colleague about the challenges of Iran. No one has fought harder for over two decades on the question of meeting the chal-

lenge of Iran, but this is not about Iran. This is about Iraq. Saddam Hussein is gone. The Iraq of 2002 is not the Iraq of 2023.

This vote shows that, while we still face challenges and threats to U.S. interests, the 1991 and 2002 authorizations for use of military force do not address those threats and are not necessary for the United States to defend against them.

This vote shows that Congress is prepared to claw back our constitutional role in deciding how and when our Nation goes to war and also when it should end wars. It also protects against future administrations abusing authorizations that outlive their mandate but remain on the books.

We can take our responsibilities once again to call if the Nation needs it and the President comes and says: I need an authorization for the use of force because country X is challenging the national security of the United States. We can do that. But we should not allow any President to use an authorization that was never intended for country X or the circumstances of that to be the excuse to go to war without coming to Congress. So I see it differently than my colleague.

To be clear, this vote has nothing to do with Iran and in no way diminishes our ability to protect U.S. interests against Iranian aggression.

It has taken a long time to get here. I want to commend my colleague Senator Kaine, who has been a constant clarion call of our responsibility and pricked the conscience of the committee and the Senate on several occasions to get to this point, and also Senator YOUNG, who has been joining him in that effort, for their stalwart commitment to get this done and to see this through to such a momentous conclusion.

This is a defining moment. I urge all my colleagues to vote to repeal the 1991 and 2002 authorizations to use military force in Iraq. We owe it to those who made the ultimate sacrifice and to their families. We owe it to the servicemembers who again may be called upon to fight. We owe it to them to demonstrate that we take our solemn duty seriously and to do what is right.

I am proud that we are taking this step today. We should all be proud of the history we are making together to pass this legislation with a strong bipartisan vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, let me thank my colleagues, our chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator MENENDEZ; Senator Kaine, who has worked on this bill not for days and not for months but for years and never gave up hope; Senator YOUNG; Senator RISCH; and so many others—thank you, Senator YOUNG—who worked so hard to make this day happen.

Twenty years after the start of the Iraq war, the Senate finally, finally, finally declares today the time has come

to repeal the legal authorities that began that war in the first place.

This is bipartisan, and that is one of the beauties of this. Democrats and Republicans joined to say that it has been long enough, that the Iraq war has long been over. These authorizations for the use of force against Iraq are no longer necessary for our security.

Make no mistake, this vote repealing the Iraq war powers is one for the history books.

The American people, as we know, are tired of endless wars in the Middle East. Every year we keep these AUMFs on the books is another chance for future administrations to abuse them.

We owe it to the over 4,000 who died in Iraq, to their families, to our servicemembers who served there, to our veterans, and all of the communities impacted by the war—we owe it to all of them to act.

There is a very good chance that both Chambers can pass these AUMF repeals before the end of this year so this bill can be signed into law. This is not just going to be a one-House action. We have good support in the House of Representatives, the President is for it, and the odds are high that this much needed legislation will become law.

Again, I hope this process can be a blueprint for how the Senate works over the next few years. We sat down with our Republican colleagues—and, of course, it is the right of the minority to offer amendments—and came to an agreement. The amendments were not dilatory. The amendments were not gotcha. They were sincere attempts to change the bill. But by allowing amendments, we allowed this bill to go forward, and we would like that to be a metaphor for the future.

We will look diligently, assiduously for opportunities to continue the Senate working successfully on bipartisan legislation in the future.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON S. 316

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired, amendment No. 15 is withdrawn, and the bill is considered read a third time.

The amendment (No. 15) was withdrawn.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL).

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 77 Leg.]

YEAS—66

Baldwin	Heinrich	Paul
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Hoeben	Rosen
Braun	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	Kelly	Schatz
Budd	King	Schmitt
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Lee	Shaheen
Carper	Lujan	Sinema
Casey	Lummis	Smith
Cassidy	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Marshall	Van Hollen
Cramer	Menendez	Vance
Daines	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Moran	Warnock
Durbin	Murkowski	Warren
Gillibrand	Murphy	Welch
Grassley	Murray	Whitehouse
Hassan	Ossoff	Wyden
Hawley	Padilla	Young

NAYS—30

Barrasso	Fischer	Romney
Blackburn	Graham	Rounds
Boozman	Hagerty	Rubio
Britt	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Mullin	Tillis
Cruz	Ricketts	Tuberville
Ernst	Risch	Wicker

NOT VOTING—4

Coons	Fetterman
Feinstein	McConnell

(Applause.)

The bill (S. 316) was passed as follows:

S. 316

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION.**

The Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102-1; 105 Stat. 3; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) is hereby repealed.

**SEC. 2. REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002.**

The Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243; 116 Stat. 1498; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) is hereby repealed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). The Senator from Michigan.

S. 870

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, fire departments across the country rely on critical Federal resources that keep firefighters and emergency responders safe. These heroes need our support as they continue protecting our communities. That is why I urge my colleagues to support the Fire Grants and Safety Act.

This bipartisan bill reauthorizes two vital grant programs administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency and also reauthorizes the U.S. Fire Administration.

Fire departments depend on these programs to address staffing needs, re-

place outdated equipment, fund fire training and education programs, and invest in health screenings for firefighters in the line of duty.

It is clear that, without these grant programs, many fire departments, especially those in smaller or more rural communities, would simply not be able to invest in their vehicles, equipment, or training that they need to protect their communities.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote to move forward with this important, bipartisan legislation that will help ensure that our firefighters and first responders have what they need.

**CLOTURE MOTION**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

**CLOTURE MOTION**

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 28, S. 870, a bill to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for the United States Fire Administration and firefighter assistance grant programs.

Charles E. Schumer, Gary C. Peters, Christopher Murphy, Catherine Cortez Masto, Tina Smith, Jack Reed, Brian Schatz, Jeanne Shaheen, Jeff Merkley, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patty Murray, Mazie Hirono, Cory A. Booker, Benjamin L. Cardin, Chris Van Hollen, Margaret Wood Hassan, Alex Padilla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 28, S. 870, a bill to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for the United States Fire Administration and firefighter assistance grant programs, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 78 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Baldwin	Britt	Cassidy
Barrasso	Brown	Collins
Bennet	Budd	Cornyn
Blackburn	Cantwell	Cortez Masto
Blumenthal	Capito	Cotton
Booker	Cardin	Cramer
Boozman	Carper	Crapo
Braun	Casey	Cruz